

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 5-8 are now pending in the application as a result of this amendment. Claims 1 and 5-8 have been amended and claims 2-4 have been cancelled. Minor amendments have been made to the specification to simply overcome the objections to the specification. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaefer et al. (US 2002/0074059 also US 6698475B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### **Claim 1**

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claims 2, 3, 4 and an additional element of, "and wherein all the vapors enter the manifold from the bottom side of the longitudinal manifold, the longitudinal manifold residing above, adjacent and parallel to a longitudinal axis of the fuel tank." In light of the amendment of claim 1, Applicants contend that Schaefer et al. does not disclose a feature of Applicants' claim 1, specifically "wherein fuel vapors collected from said remotely located vent valve merge with vapors collected from a secondary vent valve prior to entering the manifold, and wherein all the vapors enter the manifold from a bottom side of the longitudinal manifold, the longitudinal manifold residing above and parallel to a longitudinal axis of the fuel tank." None of Schaefer's vent means 7 produce vapors



that accomplish the above-quoted and claimed passage. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to claim a “longitudinal manifold” which is not disclosed by Schaefer et al.

Therefore, the Applicants believe claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom to be in condition for allowance. Additionally, support for the claim 1 amendments is evident in the original specification and/or the drawings, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 has been amended and now, in part, reads “at least one source within said tank comprising a remotely located vent valve attached to the longitudinal manifold through a concealed, internal tank vent line that is located below a level of the longitudinal manifold and that delivers vapors to the longitudinal manifold from a bottom side of the longitudinal manifold.” Additionally, claim 7 has been amended to claim a “longitudinal manifold” which is not disclosed by Schaefer et al.

The Applicants contend that Schaefer et al. does not disclose such structures and therefore, the Applicants believe claim 7, and claim 8, which depends from claim 7, to be in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments is evident in the original specification and/or the drawings, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Devall (US 6302137B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

#### Claim 1

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claims 2, 3, 4 and an additional element of, “and wherein all the vapors enter the manifold from the bottom side of the longitudinal manifold, the longitudinal manifold residing above,



adjacent and parallel to a longitudinal axis of the fuel tank.” In light of the amendment of claim 1, Applicants contend that Devall does not disclose multiple features of Applicants’ claim 1, specifically “at least one source within said tank comprises a remotely located vent valve attached to the manifold through a concealed internal tank vent line, and wherein fuel vapors collected from said remotely located vent valve merge with vapors collected from a secondary vent valve prior to entering the manifold, and wherein all the vapors enter the manifold from a bottom side of the longitudinal manifold, the longitudinal manifold residing above and parallel to a longitudinal axis of the fuel tank.”

Devall does not disclose a “remotely located vent valve” but rather, Devall discloses an upright section 58, a float 44 and a conduit inlet 52 at a remote location. Therefore, Applicants contend that this feature of their claim 1 is not met. Additionally, Applicants claim, “wherein fuel vapors collected from said remotely located vent valve merge with vapors collected from a secondary vent valve prior to entering the manifold, and wherein all the vapors enter the manifold from a bottom side of the longitudinal manifold, the longitudinal manifold residing above and parallel to a longitudinal axis of the fuel tank” Because Applicants earnestly believe that Devall does not disclose a remote vent valve, Applicants believe this element of their claim 1 to also not be met. Expanding upon this amendment, no vapors of Devall merge with “a secondary vent valve prior to entering the manifold.” Devall only discloses a vent apparatus 18. The item just outside of the vent apparatus 18 is a conduit outlet 72 possessing an upper portion of a mount tube 70, a lower portion of a mount tube 70, and a pivot axis 81. Applicants feel that these items can in no way be interpreted as “a secondary vent



valve” as claimed by Applicants. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to claim a “longitudinal manifold” which is not disclosed by Devall.

Therefore, Applicants believe claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom to be in condition for allowance. Additionally, support for the claim 1 amendments is evident in the original specification and/or the drawings, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 has been amended and now reads, “at least one source within said tank comprising a remotely located vent valve attached to the longitudinal manifold through a concealed, internal tank vent line that is located below a level of the longitudinal manifold and that delivers vapors to the longitudinal manifold from a bottom side of the longitudinal manifold.” Additionally, claim 7 has been amended to claim a “longitudinal manifold” which is not disclosed by Devall.

The Applicants contend that Devall does not disclose such structures and therefore, the Applicants believe claim 7, and claim 8, which depends from claim 7, to be in condition for allowance. Support for the claim 7 amendments is evident in the original specification and/or the drawings, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

#### SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.




## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/12/04

By:   
H. Keith Miller, Reg. No. 22,484

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

HKM:MDF:ca